



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

satisfied at not finding him. Overcome with fatigue Madame Roland retired to rest. She slept for about an hour, when she was awakened by a servant, and informed that some gentlemen of the section requested her to step into the adjoining room. "I understand what it means," replied she, calmly, "I will not make them wait." When she went into the next apartment; "We come, *citoyenne*," said the men, "to take you into custody, and to put seals upon your property. Here is a warrant of the revolutionary committee to committ you to the Abbaye." The warrant did not specify any motive for her arrest.

At seven o'clock in the morning she left her daughter and domestics, after exhorting them to calmness and patience. "You have people here who love you," said one of the commissioners observing the tears of her family. "I never had any about me who did not," replied she, while walking down stairs: from the bottom of which to the coach, drawn up on the opposite side of the street, stood two ranks of armed citizens. She proceeded gravely, with measured steps, while her eyes were fixed on these deluded men. The armed force followed the coach in two files, while the miserable populace, attracted by the sight, stopped to gaze as it passed. "*Away with her to the guillotine!*" exclaimed several persons. "Shall we draw up the blinds?" said one of the commissioners, civilly. "No, gentlemen; innocence, however oppressed, never puts on the guise of criminality: I fear not the eye of any one; nor will I conceal myself from any person's view." "You have more strength of mind than men; you wait patiently for justice." "Justice! were

justice done, I should not be now in your hands. But should an iniquitous procedure send me to the scaffold, I shall walk to it with the same tranquillity and firmness as I now pass to prison. My heart bleeds for my country, while I regret my mistake in supposing it qualified for freedom and happiness: but life I appreciate at its due value. I never feared any thing but guilt;—injustice and death I despise."

Having arrived at the Abbaye, that scene of massacre, her guides made her ascend a narrow stair-case—"Where is my room?" said she to the wife of the keeper, a woman with an agreeable countenance—The commissioners gave very strict orders; the keeper, an active, obliging, humane man, did not observe the orders which were given him, but treated Madame Roland with the greatest kindness and humanity. "Well then," said she, seating herself, and falling into a train of reflections, "I am in prison." The moments that followed, she declared, she would not have exchanged for those which might be esteemed the happiest of her life. She was sensible of the value of integrity and fortitude, united with an approving conscience. "I recalled the past to my mind," says she, "I calculated the event of the future. I devoted myself, if I may say, voluntarily to my destiny, whatever it might be: I defied its rigour, and fixed myself firmly in that state of mind, in which, without giving ourselves concern for what is to come, we seek only employment for the present." But this tranquillity in regard to her own fate extended not to that of her country and her friends.

To be Continued.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

Report of the Proceedings of the Class of History and Ancient Literature, of the French Institute, delivered at the public meeting on the 7th of July, 1809, by M. Ginguené.

M. GOSELIN has inquired into the geographical knowledge the ancients had of the coasts of India.

He conceives, that Herodotus was misled by the Persians, who were desirous of persuading him, that they had penetrated much further into India than they had done in reality under Darius, the son of Hyrcanus.—Every thing in the description of India, given by that historian, relates

only to districts, at no great distance from the river Hindus: Major Rennel therefore is mistaken, when he places on the banks of the Ganges, the Padæi, Anthropophagi, neighbours according to Herodotus of the Ichthyophagi, who dwelt on the banks of the Indus, and of the Nomades, who lived near them. The dominions of Darius he thinks, extended no further south than the vale, through which this river flows; and no further north than the Hypanis, which likewise bounded the conquests of Alexander.

M. Gosselin next defends Megasthenes and Deimachus against the severe censure passed on them by Strabo. These writers whose works have not reached us, were sent in succession on embassies beyond the Hypanis, by Seleucus Nicator. Both of them describe India under the general form of a vast triangle, the northern side of which extended from the frontiers of Bactriana to the mouths of the Ganges, and the other sides reached from these two points to the promontory, now called Cape Comorin. As the measures assigned by these ambassadors were given soon after the death of Alexander, they no doubt used the stadium, by which his marches were reckoned. This is now generally agreed to be the stadium of Aristotle, which he says makes a four hundred thousandth part of the circumference of the earth. Now if we calculate by this standard, the number of stadia assigned by these authors to the two sides of the triangle terminating at Cape Comorin, and set them off by the compasses, or in a straight line, on Major Rennel's large map, we shall find the distances perfectly agree. It is true, if we trust to Eratosthenes, as quoted by Strabo and Arrian, we shall find the measure of the north side, as given by Megasthenes, too short by near a third. But M. Gosselin supposes that there was an error of the transcriber, in the copy of Megasthenes, used by Eratosthenes, sixteen thousand stadia being put instead of twenty-six thousand; which would agree as nearly as can be expected with the truth, and is confirmed by the portion of the

itineraries of Alexander and Seleucus, preserved by Pliny.

To these general data, Megasthenes added astronomical observations, which prove, that the latitudes between which India was included were, not unknown to him. These observations being transmitted to Alexandria, were afterwards mistaken and altered by the geographers of that school, in order to make them agree with their erroneous estimation of the measure employed by Megasthenes, and the systematic notions they had framed of the latitudes of India. M. Gosselin traces their errors, points out their cause, and then corrects them.

About thirty years after, Patrocles was sent into India by Antiochus Soter, and brought back a new description of that country. He also considered it as of a triangular figure, but apparently assigns very different measures to its sides. He gives only about two thirds of the number of stadia to each side, a circumstance of itself sufficient to lead to the conjecture, that his stadium was not the same: and if we suppose that he used the stadium, which Posidonius afterwards attempted to revive and appropriate to himself, and of which two hundred and forty thousand were equal to the circumference of the globe, his measures will differ little from those of Megasthenes.

It was for want of attending to this difference in the standards employed, that subsequent geographers rejected the authority sometimes of one, and sometimes of the other; and that Eratosthenes, endeavouring to rectify the apparent inaccuracies and disagreements of the various writers who had preceded him, deviated still farther from the truth, and gave India the form of a rhomboid. His map however, which is traced by Mr. Gosselin, was almost generally adopted, and will serve to elucidate many obscure passages in subsequent authors.

The sovereigns of Alexandria, desirous of making themselves masters of the trade to India, did every thing in their power to promote the progress of navigation. Vessels sailing from the Arabian Gulf, our Red Sea,

coasted along the shore as far as Malabar; and some even to the mouths of the Ganges. But in the first century of our present era navigators had observed, that regular winds prevailed periodically in those seas. Hippalus, trusting to these winds first ventured to leave the coast of Arabia behind him, launched out into the open sea, and as he expected, was wafted to the shores of India. Hence his grateful contemporaries gave the name of Hippalus to the wind that conveyed him thither, the leuconotus of the Greeks and Romans, and our south west monsoon. The north east monsoon brought him back to the entrance of the Arabian Gulf, and thus we may trace his course without fear of being mistaken.

Of all the itineraries of India, published in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, we have only the *Peripus* of the Erythrean Sea. This, according to M. Gosselin, is very accurate, till it approaches the Ganges; and it is altogether erroneous beyond that river, which the Alexandrian navigators had scarcely ever passed in those days. It was not till near the end of the first century, that Marinus Tyrius was enabled to collect fresh information, and construct new maps, in which he in some degree supplied the deficiency of the *Peripus* with respect to these coasts of India. As his works are lost, all our knowledge of them is derived from Ptolemy, who sometimes adopts, and sometimes criticises his opinions. M. Gosselin describes and examines the coast of India, as they are represented by both these geographers; first from the Hindus to the promontory of Cory, opposite Taprobana; and then from this promontory to the regions beyond the Ganges, the Golden Chersonese, and lastly to Catigara.—The figure of India in the maps of these geographers is strangely irregular; but the distances between the harbours, rivers, and capes, are given by Marinus Tyrius, with a degree of accuracy hitherto not suspected. This, M. Gosselin proves by restoring his map, which Ptolemy had disfigured by his pretended corrections, and comparing the distances collected by

Marinus, with those determined by the moderns. Beyond Cape Cory however it appears that the standard of measurement in the ancient map changes; and both Marinus Tyrius and Ptolemy, misled by vague information, have laid down the coasts of Coromandel twice in succession, prolonging them to the Ganges, and omitting the coasts of the Circars, Orixa, and part of Bengal.

The text of Ptolemy has not reached us unaltered. The later Greeks added to it the discoveries made down to their time beyond Catigara, where Ptolemy stopped; and through a singular blunder, they placed on this side that point, the new countries that lay beyond it. M. Gosselin points out and corrects all these errors, and concludes with an examination of the coast of Taprobana, anciently Simundus, or rather Palæsimundus, and now Ceylon. In this part he solves several difficulties in what has been written on this island by Ptolemy, Strabo, Pliny, and others; and reduces within due bounds the exagerations and fabulous reports given by the ambassadors, which the king of Taprobana sent to the emperor Claudius, part of which he ascribes to the misinterpretation of the Romans.

M. Barbié du Bocage communicated to the class, the commencement of his inquiries into the topography of the plain of Argos. Having drawn up by order of the French government, a large map of the Morea, which is now engraving at the war office in Paris, he was led to compare the present state of the country with the ancient; and has particularly examined the most celebrated part of it, Argos and its surrounding plain, which now present an aspect very different from what they formerly bore.

The learned are sometimes blamed for discussing subjects, on which more than enough has already been written; but it is often this very superfluity which induces them to write. Thus, though long articles, tracts, nay volumes, have been written on the masks of the ancients, *M. Mongez* has thought fit to resume the subject, by way of setting it at rest. We know that the mask worn by the

ancient actors had a very large mouth; but what was the reason of this?—Some have supposed, that metallic plates were included in it, to increase the sound of the voice; others that it had the form of a shell, in order to produce the effect of the modern speaking trumpet. Barthélémy, in his *Anacharsis*, is decidedly for the former opinion; and quotes for his authorities Pliny, Solinus, Aulus Gellius, and Cassiodorus; to say nothing of Abbe Dubos, who had only mistaken the ancients before him. Pliny says, that the stone calcophonos, when struck, sounded like brass; and that tragic actors should never omit wearing it. Solinus, who almost always copies Pliny, adds that this stone preserves the clearness of the voice. Both these passages however merely indicate, that the calcophonos was a proper amulet for tragedians, as the jasper was for warriors, and as a hundred others were supposed for various purposes, both by the ancients and moderns, in the ages of credulity. Aulus Gellius says, that the head and face of the actor being entirely covered by the mask, which has but one opening through which the voice can issue, the sound is rendered stronger and clearer by it. But here is no mention of the peculiar form of the mouth, or of plates of metal fixed in it. Cassiodorus says nothing of the mouth of the mask: he merely ascribes the extent and strength of the voice in tragic declamation, to the reverberations of concavities; and it does not even appear, whether he speaks of the hollow of the mask, or of the circular form of the theatre. Abbe Dubos had fancied, from what Pliny and Solinus say of the calcophonos, that the ancients first lined the mouth of the mask with brass, and then placed in it very thin plates of a kind of marble! This whimsical idea he attempts to support by a passage of Quintilian, who speaks of the ridiculousness of laughter in a mask: but the Roman author is not speaking, as Dubos supposes, of a disagreeable sound produced by laughter issuing through an artificial mouth-piece; he merely alludes to the incongruity of the sound of laughter with the features exhibited by a tragic mask.

Both these hypotheses appear to have arisen from the imaginary impossibility of an unassisted voice being heard through the extent of the ancient theatres: but experiments lately made at those of Saguntum in Spain, Taurominum in Sicily, and Verona in Italy, leave no doubt on this head. We may safely conclude therefore, that the reason why the ancients made the mouth both of the tragic and comic masks so large, as to admit of the teeth and even the lips being seen through them, was merely that the voice might receive no obstruction.

Another subject discussed by M. Mongez is that of the vessels called lachrymatory. These, which are small phials of glass or earthen ware with long slender necks, and commonly found in Sarcophagi, in ancient urns, where they are mixed with ashes and fragments of bones, are supposed to have held the tears of the mourners. As they are not very well adapted for catching these, and little spoons are sometimes found with them, or even in them, some have embellished the fiction by representing these spoons as used to collect the tears, and transfer them to the phials. The ancients however are totally silent respecting any such practice. Petronius indeed says, of the servant of the matron of Ephesus, *lachrymas commodabat lugenti*, "she lent the mourner tears;" but none of the commentators understand this literally. The only support it has beside conjecture is a bas relief, said to have been found at Padua, on which a funeral procession is represented, and one of the females attending, is holding a vessel of this kind to her eye, as if to catch the tears. This sculpture however is undoubtedly a forgery, and apparently of the fifteenth century, in which M. Mongez had before supposed this notion was first broached. Accordingly he still continues of opinion, with Schoepflin and Paciaudi, that these little vessels were used, not for tears, but for liquid balsams, perfumes, or odoriferous oils, which the relations of the deceased poured on the body when placed on the funeral pile, and on the ashes before they were enclosed in the urns. In

confirmation of this, M. Mongez gives two figures from acknowledged antiques, in which small vessels of precisely the same shape are evidently designed to hold perfumes, and diffuse their odour.

Another subject, discussed by the same gentleman, is the signification of the words διπλός, *duplex*, and their derivatives, with the dress of the cynic philosophers. Translators have generally rendered the words ιπαλίον διπλάς by *pallium duplex*, or double cloak, without considering whether it meant a cloak as big again as usual, a cloak of double the common thickness, a cloak doubled by folding, a cloak wrapped twice round the body, or a cloak with a lining. All of these, except the last, M. Mongez finds on ancient monuments, or in ancient authors; but which of them was the double cloak of the cynics? Winkelmann, speaking of the statue of one of these philosophers at the villa Albani, concludes, that it was neither, but a cloak with a lining, because the cloak of that statue is not doubled by folding. M. Mongez however shows, that the learned German antiquary was mistaken; and that the cynic cloak differed from that of the other Grecians merely in being thus doubled.

Mr Lewis Petit-Radel pursues his inquiries of a different kind in an investigation of the original historical monuments of Celtiberia and particularly those of Tarragona. He conceived, that the military remains of a city so celebrated in history, must, from their native and gigantic proportions, be connected with all the facts, that confirm the remote period of the civilization of Europe, and particularly with the primitive history of Celtiberia; and that there must have been a connection between the ancient inhabitants of this coast and the Pelasgo-Tyrrhenian colonies on the coast opposite. Accordingly, after examining the military remains of Tarragona, he has compared the geographical records of the country between the Ebro and Pyrenees, and of ancient Baetica, with those of the coast of Italy from Piombino to Puzzuolo. Having examined the

ancient coins of both countries, the perfect resemblance, which the Celtiberian and Turdetanian characters bear to the old Greek, confirms him in his opinion, that the historical, if not the primitive civilization of Celtiberia, originated from the Tyrrhenian Pelasgi settled on the coasts of Iberia and Latium. M. de Laborde first observed, in his Picturesque tour through Spain, that the Roman walls of Tarragona, built by the Scipios, have for their base the gigantic ruins of the original enclosure; and that the stones of the Roman structure are marked with the same Celtiberian characters, as are found on the most ancient coins and monuments of that region. It appears too, from a plan of the walls of Tarragona, communicated to M. Petit-Radel, in 1805, by a learned Spaniard, Mr. Antony de Marty, that the modern city is included within the circumference of the Roman, being to it in the proportion of eight thousand Castilian feet to fourteen thousand; and that the ancient city was even much larger than the Roman. The primitive ramparts are composed of enormous blocks of stone; but notwithstanding their bulk and irregularity, M. Petit-Radel does not find in them the characteristics, by which he distinguishes the Cyclopean structures; though every thing convinces him of their high antiquity. He finds in them too the marks of Greek construction, not Carthaginian, as he at first thought. At Barcelona however he perceives the characteristics of Carthaginian building; and the evident difference between the military remains of these two cities he considers as a proof, that the Greeks and Carthaginians had both founded cities in Baetica at different times.

To ascertain the period, unquestionably very remote of the Greek or Peiastic foundation of Tarragona he has recourse, with the best critics, to the topographical synonimes of regions, mountains, rivers, people, and cities. Of these he quotes so many striking ones, in comparing the coasts of Iberia and ancient Latium with the Celtiberia of the ancients, we are astonished with him, that the ancients themselves do not

appear to have been struck with the similitude. The time he fixes on for the foundation of the city is that when the Pelasgi; who about the year 1539, B.C. had left Elis, and taken refuge on the coast of Italy afterward called the Tyrrhenian, where they lived in great prosperity for near two centuries, and built flourishing cities; were driven thence by famine and contagious diseases, as we are informed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, whom Freer endeavours in vain to refute, and settled among the barbarians. Sailing from the coast of Hetruria, they landed on that of Celtiberia, and there fixed themselves nearly in the same order as before. Hence we find in both countries the same names of people, rivers, and towns; a remarkable circumstance, which can have no other cause.

A letter of M. Favel, from Athens, dated the 14th of June 1808, affords M. Petit-Radel farther confirmation of his general theory of ancient structures. It contains an account of the ruins of two cities lately discovered in Asia Minor, by M. Gropius, a Westphalian artist. They are at the foot of mount Sipylus, on the confines of Ionia, Aolia, and Lydia. The walls of one are formed of rough stones, but square, and in regular courses; those of the other are constructed with irregular polygons. This is built on a hill near the sea; and on a con-

tinuation of the same hill are above a hundred tombs, some of which are surrounded by a wall formed of irregular polygonal stones, like the walls of Mycenæ, and of Larissa in Thessaly; while others are enclosed within a wall of regularly squared stones, like the tombs within the walls of Mycenæ, and like the walls of cities of Ionian foundation, and all the structures in general that have a certain date posterior to that of the arrival of the Egyptian colony under Danaus. Here we have the same two ages for the foundation of these cities as appear in all the similar ruins discovered in Greece and Italy. Strabo peoples the coast, where M. Gropius has made these discoveries, with Pelasgian from Thessaly. The walls of Larissa, Lamia, and Pharsalia, in Thessaly, are constructed of irregular polygons, like those of the maritime city discovered by M. Gropius. The bed of the Cayster too is contracted by two quays of similar structure: and this was a common practice, according to Strabo, of the Larisseans of Thessaly, from which country he derives the Larisseans of this part of the coast of Asia. Hence M. Petit-Radel concludes, that these remains are partly those of Pelasgian colonists from Thessaly, partly those of Ionian colonists; and that the different kinds of tombs answer to the two periods of their establishment.

DETACHED ANECDOTES.

OFFENDERS ESCAPE, BECAUSE THE LAWS ARE TOO SEVERE.

FROM the tables in Howard's State of Prisons, we learn that at the different assizes within the Oxford circuit, for seven years, from 1764, 690 persons were tried, and 615 acquitted; besides 293 discharged by proclamation.

Within the home circuit from 1764 to 1770, inclusive, 159 were burnt in the hand, 96 whipped, and 386 acquitted. In the Norfolk circuit from 1750 to 1772, 434 condemned to death, and

only 117 executed. In the same space of time, for the midland circuit, 518 condemned to death, and 116 executed. And at the Old Bailey, London, from 1749 to 1771, inclusive, 1121 sentenced to die, and 678 executed.

The number of those acquitted must be referred to many escaping through the lenity of judges, juries, and prosecutors, struggling against a law, to which their feelings were in opposition, rather than to the innocence of the accused, as it is not to